ward, should not be able to ascend, step by step, according as his talent and assiduity may qualify him. I see no adequate reason why clerks should always be joiners and stonemasons, nor why, in every building, the architect should not have his representative frequently or constantly on the spot, who might be one of his own pupils or more advanced assistants, according to the capacity of the clerk and the importance of the work.

Were this done, I apprehend that young practitioners would be better grounded in the principles of their profession than they are now; that architects would fulfil their part of indentures more truly than they do now; that feeling that they were acquiring practical knowledge, getting known and getting forward, young architects would not be quite so impatient of becoming principals; for I believe that they generally feel painfully conscious of the weakness which results from the want of experience. The adoption of this practice would enable an architect to place a deserving pupil in the way of earning some pecuniary advantage, as it would happen that proprietors would consent to the employment of a clerk of the works more frequently, if the charge were, as it might be, materially reduced. During the erection of the carcase of the building I am quite convinced of the absolute necessity of having a superintendent *always* on the spot, in order that the specification may be carried out in all its integrity, and full justice done to the proprietor.

Looking to the functions of an architect in a mercantile spirit—as an agent for the proprietor of the building, and as arbitrator between the proprietor and the contractor—it seems important that he should not be in any degree personally interested in the results of his conduct, of his advice and award, beyond the usual professional charges. He should not only be honest, but above suspicion; and as every one's judgment is liable to be warped by supposed self-interest, he should carefully secure himself against the possible influence of personal advantage. Yet we know that the patentees of various improved articles for building purposes will accompany their prospectuses with gentle intimations that the articles "will be supplied on terms of mutual accommodation;" or that "a liberal commission is allowed to architects who introduce them into their specifications." Now it is reasonable to presume that such proposals would not be made in this barefaced manner, if they were not agreeable to *some* parties; but that the practice reflects no credit upon the profession, I think all its respectable members will admit. I do not know any architect who will publicly defend the custom, and avow that he benefits thereby. So also with contractors: there are some who are willing to allow the architect a commission upon all the work they get through him; and there *are* architects who insist upon having one. Now, as one part of an architect's duty to the proprietor consists in rejecting bad workmanship and improper materials, he will possibly be brought into collision with the contractor or the patent nostrum vendor; and, consequently, his independence or his retaining fee will be jeopardised. He is thus like an ass between two bundles of hay; and as he occupies the position through his own folly, I consider the resemblance very complete. Of course the architect who is most likely to practise in this way is he who professes to work on a *low* commission from his avowed employer; and as he obtains a high commission from the ironfounder who supplies the grates and kitchen-range; from the cement agent, the paperhanger, the dealer in encaustic tiles, and any and everybody else, we cannot be surprised if he realises a handsome income before the end of the year.

Rather better than such as this is the architect who joins in partnership with a builder; because here the connection is avowed, it is all fair and above board; and if people about to build will employ a gentleman so circumstanced, they do it with their eyes open, and have only themselves to blame for the result. I should not myself anticipate that an architect would reject his partner's bad materials, or that he would have his defective work taken down; yet we know that every builder must of necessity have materials more or less imperfect, which he is desirous of using up, and that he may have careless or incompetent workmen. But surely when the public are architects forming connections of this kind (which seem to me very like the union of the medical practitioner with the compounder of medicines, or of the attorney with the barrister), they may be excused if they slide into the belief, that after all it is of little importance if they employ an architect or not. In fact, by going to a builder first-hand, they appear to save themselves trouble and the architect's commission also. I cannot but think this is a fearful delusion; but of course it is very natural that I, an architect, should say so.

Again, it is being found generally convenient that bills of quantities should be prepared for every building which is being offered for contract by tender; and in several cases the architect himself prepares these bills of quantities. This, I think, is, legally speaking, very hazardous to the proprietor; for as the architect is his agent, I fear he becomes responsible for the accuracy of the quantities so prepared. Passing over this objection, I think there is danger, in case of any deficiency in the quantities, that the architect will be tempted to enlarge the amount of the extra bill, in order to make things pleasant to the contractor, and to screen his own mistakes. I hold, therefore, that bills of quantities should always be prepared by some third party, in order that the irresponsibility of the proprietor and the impartiality of the architect may be preserved inviolate.

There is one almost universal accompaniment to a building contract which it would be well to abrogate altogether, and yet which seems irremediably united to it, as inseparably as effect to cause. It reminds me of the time-worn conundrum: "What is that which comes with a coach, goes with a coach, is of no use to a coach, and yet a coach cannot go without it?" As *noise* to a coach, so is the bill of extras to the contract. It is clear that if there were no contract there could be no extras; and if there be a contract, it is equally clear that everything ought to be included in it. But from a variety of causes, for some of which the Profession are, and for some they are not, responsible, the extra bill seems ubiquitous. A fruitful source is the ignorance of proprietors, who, being unable to understand drawings, sometimes exclaim, when the work has progressed, "Oh! I never intended this: this will never do: it must be altered;" and straightway the alteration is made, the proprietor fancying that it will cost him nothing, but "is included in the contract." Did he understand drawings, specifications, and contracts, he would have a different opinion; but as respects building, his is a most arcadian simplicity, extremely verdant, and his professional adviser too frequently leaves him unenlightened until the settlement of the accounts:—

"Then comes the reckoning when the banquet's o'er,
The dreadful reckoning, and men smile no more."

For bland courtesy is nowhere, being completely distanced by litigations, disputes, hard words, and bad temper, which "chase all their smiles away."

But whilst great extra expense is, without doubt, occasioned by the ignorance and caprice of principals, it must be admitted, in all frankness, that it is also occasioned by the ignorance, carelessness, or dishonesty of architects. The counts of ignorance and carelessness I do not anticipate will be traversed: that of dishonesty may be. It is twofold: first, there are those who hold that in competitions, as in love and war, all is fair; that is, that every artifice may be practised by which the committee may be beguiled into adopting the design: consequently, in a church to accommodate 1,000 persons, at a cost of 2,500*l.* florid drawings are prepared with details at large of some of the features, such as the east window, the font, the bench ends, and the pulpit; and they are all elaborately worked, and all included in the estimate. Now we know that such an estimate for such a design must be fallacious; but building committees, as they are not composed of men of the world, but of people who were never on 'change, never speculated in shares, or cotton, or corn, and, consequently, quite ignorant of the little deceits usually deemed allowable by those who have no objection to sail close to the wind, provided they can hedge a loss, or book a gain—of course, these simple-minded men trust most confidingly to the author of this very attractive design, "so beautifully drawn," and with "such elaborate details;" and when the contract is closed, they are surprised to find that it has cost 1,500*l.* extra, and that the spire is still incomplete! Now, a case like this illustrates the demoralizing tendency of competitions; as there *are* architects habitually engaged in the competition business who defend such practices, on the plea that as committees must know that all they require cannot be provided for the money, they are not taken in more than they deserve to be. I need not delay to expose the contemptible sophistry of this excuse; nor to point out the injuriousness of the practice to those competitors who act uprightly, and upon the character of the profession at large.

The other form of dishonesty is akin to this, and is practised when, without the poor excuse derived from the excitement of a competition, the architect deliberately tells his employer that the cost will be one sum, when he knows at the time that it will be very much more. Now, of course, when a gentleman does employ an architect, he expects that his interests will be properly protected; but if he finds that they are not; that, in fact, his confidence is abused, can we wonder if for the future he eschews architects, and advises his friends to do so likewise? And thus many of the profession suffer from the default of one.

But besides the merely agent functions which appertain to an architect, there are others which partake of a more elevated rank and influence. The former might be discharged by any man of business who possessed the requisite practical knowledge; and in fact are sometimes so assumed by estate agents and others, when they find the proceeds of their more proper pursuits declining in value; but the latter are the peculiar functions of the architect, considered as an artist, as him whose province it is to elevate the "human beaver" into a man, and record for posterity the progressive spiritual advance or retrogression of each generation. We have been told that the architect should rank with the poet, the prophet, and the teacher; meaning, I suppose, that as it is the office of these to embody in language those ideas and passions which belong to our race, and while thus enlisting our sympathies, soothing grief, and tempering joy, turn all our thoughts from earth heavenward,—so it belongs to the architect to spiritualise the material necessities of our physical existence, to inspire their outward forms with celestial fire, and to impress upon the mere mechanics of life evidence of a spirit not of time only, but of eternity; that thus we may not only minister to the gratification of the passing hour and refine its more sensuous and commonplace features, but recal for admonition the achievements of the past, and foreshadow in dim, but gigantic outlines, the misty glories of the coming future. Thus each architect becomes a bard in stone, and every building a minstrel lay. So should stray volumes of our standard writers float down the stream of time, and, after many days, be found again: when those who find retrace the course by which these works descended, some evidence may appear in the buildings that remain that the poetic spirit of those writers was shared by their contemporaries. But should such a retrospect be made, what have we now to produce in testimony of any real sympathy between the poets and the age?

Our railways are extremely useful; but except where nature necessitated the deep cutting, the lofty embankment, the mysterious tunnel, there is nothing that claims kindred with spiritual beauty. Nature is ever ready to impress upon all objects tokens that shall speak of something more than mere mate-

To learn about PDF Compression and OCR go to ThePaperlessOffice.org